

STUDY ON GROWTH PERFORMANCE OF BROILER SUPPLEMENTED WITH ORGANIC ACIDS IN THEIR DIET AS AN ALTERNATIVE TO ANTIBIOTICS

J. N. BANJADE¹, D. B. NEPALI², J. L. YADAV³ & M. SAPKOTA⁴

¹Scientist, Nepal Agricultural Research Council, Regional Agricultural Research Station, Khajura, Banke, Nepal

^{2, 3, 4} Professors, Institute of Agriculture and Animal Science, Rampur, Chitwan, Nepal

ABSTRACT

An experiment was conducted in a completely randomized design to determine the effects of feeding organic acids as an alternative to antibiotics in the diet of broiler chicken at IAAS, livestock farm from February 20 to April 7, 2006. There were altogether 7 treatments replicated thrice and each experimental unit consisted of 10 birds. The treatments were Standard ration (SR) (T₁), SR + antibiotics (T₂), SR + 300 mg ascorbic acid/kg diet (T₃), SR + 0.02 % acify (T₄), SR + 0.03 % acify (T₅), SR + 300 mg ascorbic acid/kg diet + 0.02 % acify (T₆) and SR + 300 mg ascorbic acid/kg diet + 0.03 % acify (T₇). The commercial acidifier used was acify (0.2ml/lit, 0.3ml/lit of drinking water), chlortetracycline and ascorbic acid were used at the rate of 500 mg/kg and 300 mg /kg of feed.. The average weekly body weight for 3rd week was found significant (P<0.05) and maximum body weight (729.53 g) in broilers fed on T₇. A significantly higher (P< 0.05) live weight gain was observed on the third and the fifth week in broilers fed on T₇. The significant differences in feed consumption were observed, and maximum feed consumption (639.97 g), (865.0 g) and (1146.75 g) were observed in birds fed on T₃, T₆ and T₂ for the third, fourth, and sixth week respectively. Feed efficiency for the third week was significantly (p< 0.05) poor (2.03) in T₃.

KEYWORDS: Ascorbic Acid & Acify

Received: Jun 28 2017; **Accepted:** Jul 15 2017; **Published:** Jul 22, 2017; **Paper Id.:** IJASRAUG201754

INTRODUCTION

Acidification has the potential of controlling all enteric bacteria, both pathogenic and non-pathogenic (Miller, 1987). Various organic acids including formic, fumaric, propionic and sorbic have been added to broiler feed resulting in positive response (Vogt *et al.*, 1981). These acids may enhance growth and feed efficiency by eliminating organisms that compete with the bird for nutrients, a benefit attributed to antibiotics. However, the uses of antibiotics have caused some concern because of drug resistance (Bates *et al.*, 1994). Organic acids in their undissociated forms are able to pass through the cell membrane of bacteria. Once inside the cell, the acid dissociates to produce +H ions which lower the pH of the cell causing the organism to use of its energy in trying to restore the normal balance, whereas the RCOO⁻ anions produced from the acid can disrupt DNA and protein synthesis, putting the organisms under stress so that it is unable to replicate or replicate rapidly (Nursey, 1997). The lower pH conditions thus protect the animal from infection especially at young ages. In recent years, there has been an increased interest in the effect of organic acids on feed efficiency and bird performance (Pattern and Waldroup, 1988).¹

The main objective of this study was to determine the effect of different types and doses of organic acids supplementation in the diet as an alternative to antibiotics on the overall performance and economics of broiler

production.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The experiment was conducted at the Institute of Agriculture and Animal Science, livestock Farm, Rampur, Chitwan from February 20th to April 7, 2006. Two hundred ten, day old Vencobb broiler chicks were obtained from commercial hatchery and reared in battery brooder for one week. After brooding, chicks were transferred to experimental 3.3 m² sized pen. The experiment was conducted in completely randomized design (CRD), there was altogether seven treatments and replicated thrice. Each experimental unit consisted of 10 birds.

Two types of rations, one for broiler starter (0-4 weeks) and another for broiler finisher (5-6 weeks) were formulated. Both broiler starter and finisher ration contained 3000 ME kcal/kg, and 21 and 19 percent crude protein respectively. Both rations were fortified with powdered form of ascorbic acid. Chlortetracycline was also mixed in the ration 500 mg/kg of feed. The acidifier was fed to the birds through drinking water. The acidifier contained lactic acid, fumaric acid, citric acid, formic acid, citrate, oxine copper and essential oils.

Table 1: Percent Ingredients Composition of Broiler Starter and Finisher Rations

Ingredients	Starter Ration (0-4 Wks)	Finisher Ration (5-6 Wks)
Maize	55.20	59.40
Rice polish	4.00	7.47
SBM	29.60	26.20
Soya oil	1.80	0.80
Sunflower cake	5.30	2.50
Bone meal	2.72	2.33
Lime stone	0.56	0.53
Salt	0.25	0.25
Lysine	0.04	0.00
Methionine	0.18	0.17
Vitamin and mineral (Brovit)	0.20	0.20
Chekotox (Toxin binder)	0.10	0.10
Zuricox (Coccidiostat)	0.05	0.05
Total	100	100

The composition of broiler rations is presented table 1. The feeding trial lasted for 42 days. The treatments were Standard ration (SR) (T₁), SR + antibiotics (T₂), SR + 300 mg ascorbic acid/kg diet (T₃), SR + 0.02 % acify (T₄), SR + 0.03 % acify (T₅), SR + 300 mg ascorbic acid /kg diet + 0.02 % acify (T₆) and SR + 300 mg ascorbic acid/kg diet + 0.03 % acify (T₇). The feed and water were offered *ad libitum* to birds and were vaccinated as scheduled.

The weekly feed intake, body weight and body weight gain were recorded. The data obtained from the study were analyzed statistically using MSTAT.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

FEED CONSUMPTION

The average weekly feed consumption of broiler (g / bird) fed diet with different levels of organic acids is presented in Table 3. The analysis of variance showed significant ($p < 0.05$) difference in weekly feed consumption in the 3rd, 4th, 6th week respectively. Significantly higher feed consumption (639.97 g) in third week was recorded in T₃ than T₂ and T₄ (611.50 and 618.33 g) respectively but it was at par with rest of the treatment. Whenever the birds are under

summer stress the feed consumption lowers, but due to the ascorbic acid supplementation in the diets, heat stress was lowered resulting in higher feed intakes. This is supported by findings of Mckee and Harrison (1995) who observed a significantly greater feed intake in chicks provided either 150 or 300 ppm ascorbic acid. Kutlu and Forbes (1993) reported that heat stressed broiler chicks provided with 200 ppm ascorbic acid consumed more feed than those not supplemented.

Likewise, for 4th week significantly higher feed consumption (865.00 g) was recorded in T₆ than T₃, T₂, T₅ (833.00, 835.17, 839.00 gm) but it was at par with T₄, T₁, T₇ (846.00, 850.00, 858.33 g) respectively. The birds consumed more feed in T₆ due to the better utilization of nutrients and combined effect of organic acid which might have resulted in increased body weight gain and hence increased consumption of feeds. The highest feed consumption (1146.75 g) was recorded in birds which were on T₂ diet and differed significantly with the values of T₃, T₄, and T₅, but it was at par with rest of the treatments which indicated that antibiotics were more influencing additive than either ascorbic acid alone or combination of ascorbic acid with acify during the 6th week of age.

Table 3: The Average Weekly Feed Consumption (G) of Vencobb Broilers Fed Diet with Organic Acids as an Alternative to Antibiotics

Treatment	Period (Week) and Feed Consumption (G)					
	2	3	4	5	6	Overall Mean
T ₁ = Standard ration	377.67	629.50 ^{ab}	850.00 ^{abc}	1000.67 ^a	1113.33 ^{abc}	794.23
T ₂ = SR + antibiotics	358.00	611.50 ^c	835.17 ^c	1015.83 ^a	1146.75 ^a	793.45
T ₃ = SR + 300 mg aa/kg diet	363.00	639.97 ^a	833.00 ^c	950.00 ^b	1097.33 ^c	776.66
T ₄ = SR + 0.02 % acify	366.00	618.33 ^{bc}	846.00 ^{abc}	1000.33 ^a	1090.33 ^c	784.20
T ₅ = SR + 0.03 % acify	373.00	624.00 ^{abc}	839.00 ^{bc}	965.67 ^{ab}	1101.33 ^{bc}	780.60
T ₆ = SR + 300 mg aa/kg diet + 0.02 % acify	369.33	634.00 ^{ab}	865.00 ^a	967.00 ^{ab}	1118.33 ^{abc}	790.73
T ₇ = SR + 300 mg aa/kg diet + 0.03 % acify	365.33	630.10 ^{ab}	858.33 ^{ab}	989.03 ^{ab}	1141.80 ^{ab}	796.92
LSD	ns	15.70	20.89	45.38	38.56	
CV %	3.17	1.43	1.41	2.63	1.97	
SE m ±	6.73	5.18	6.89	14.96	12.71	

Means within the column followed by the different superscript are significantly different (P< 0.05) by DMRT

BODY WEIGHT

The average weekly body weights of broilers fed diet with acify, ascorbic acid, antibiotics and without acify is presented in Table 4. Average initial body weight of broilers showed no significant differences among treatments. Significant difference in average weekly body weight was observed only in third week. The values for third week were 695, 680, 679, 714, 704.67, 720, and 729.53 g respectively for T₁, T₂, T₃, T₄, T₅, T₆, and T₇. The highest body weight (729.53 g) of broiler was observed in T₇ and lowest (679.00 g) in T₃. These values differed significantly (p< 0.05). The highest body weight in T₇ might be due to acidifier which lowered the intestinal pH and might have increased the population of useful bacteria and decreased the population of harmful bacteria by the acidification of gut. In addition, ascorbic acid might have reduced body temperature and respiratory rates of broiler chicken that resulted in increased body weight at respective week. The result confirms to the findings of Langhout (2000) who reported that organic acids reduce production of toxic components by bacteria and change in the morphology of the intestinal wall and reduces colonization of pathogens on the intestinal wall, thus preventing damage to the epithelial cells.

Table 4: Average Weekly Body Weight (G) of Vencobb Broilers Fed Diet with Organic Acids as an Alternative to Antibiotics

Treatments	Period (Week) And Body Weight (G)						Overall Mean
	Initial Wt.	2	3	4	5	6	
T ₁ = Standard ration	166.00	373.33	695.00 ^{bc}	1185.33	1623.00 ^{ab}	2028.00	1011.78
T ₂ = SR + antibiotics	167.33	366.00	680.00 ^c	1168.00	1580.67 ^{bc}	2056.50	1003.08
T ₃ = SR + 300 mg aa/kg diet	157.67	362.67	679.00 ^c	1156.00	1558.33 ^c	2002.00	985.95
T ₄ = SR + 0.02 % acify	160.00	368.00	714.00 ^{ab}	1172.33	1605.67 ^{abc}	2053.33	1012.22
T ₅ = SR + 0.03 % acify	165.00	376.00	704.67 ^{abc}	1168.33	1577.00 ^{bc}	2014.00	1000.83
T ₆ = SR + 300 mg aa/kg diet + 0.02 % acify	171.33	384.67	720.00 ^{ab}	1200.33	1612.33 ^{abc}	2060.67	1024.89
T ₇ = SR + 300 mg aa/kg diet + 0.03 % acify	158.00	368.00	729.53 ^a	1188.00	1644.47 ^a	2077.87	1027.70
LSD	ns	ns	29.65	ns	54.03	ns	
CV %	4.40	3.18	2.41	1.96	1.93	2.32	
SE m ±	4.15	6.82	9.78	13.34	17.81	27.39	

Means within the column followed by the different superscript are significantly different (P< 0.05) by DMRT

BODY WEIGHT GAIN

The average weekly weight gain of broiler fed on different levels of organic acid is presented in Table 5. The analysis of variance on average weekly weight gain of broiler showed statistically significant (P< 0.05) in 3rd and 5th week. In third week, a significantly higher body weight gain of broiler (361.53 g) was recorded in T₇ than T₁, T₂, T₃, T₅ (321.67, 314.00, 316.33, 328.67 g) respectively. However, the same value was at par with T₆ and T₄ (335.33, 346.00 g) respectively. The highest body weight gain might be due to better utilization of nutrient. Hadorn *et al.*, 2000; Partanen *et al.*, 2002 also observed acid combinations had an intensified response than in single acid.

Likewise, for 5th week also a significantly higher weekly body weight gain (456.47 g) was recorded on T₇ than T₃, T₅, T₆, T₂ (402.33, 408.67, 412.00, 412.67 g), but was at par with T₄ and T₁ (433.33, 437.67g) respectively. The acidic condition in broiler's digestive system allowed the establishment of specific pH and microorganisms particularly *Lactobacillus sps* (Sarra *et al.*, 1985). The mutual situation between microflora and pH prevented *E. coli* growth and this condition makes the absorptive area more beneficial (Dofing and Gottschal, 1997). Acidic conditions make more nutrients available (Boling *et al.*, 2001) which monitors better performance.

Table 5: Average Weekly Body Weight Gain (G) of Vencobb Broiler Fed Diets with Organic Acids as an Alternative to Antibiotics

Treatment	Period (Week) and Body Weight Gain (G)					
	2	3	4	5	6	Overall Mean
T ₁ = Standard ration	207.33	321.67 ^{bc}	490.33	437.67 ^{ab}	405.00	372.40
T ₂ = SR + antibiotics	198.67	314.00 ^c	488.00	412.67 ^b	475.83	377.83
T ₃ =SR + 300 mg aa/kg diet	205.00	316.33 ^{bc}	477.00	402.33 ^b	443.67	368.87
T ₄ = SR + 0.02 % acify	208.00	346.00 ^{ab}	458.33	433.33 ^{ab}	447.67	378.67
T ₅ = SR + 0.03 % acify	211.00	328.67 ^{bc}	463.67	408.67 ^b	437.00	369.80
T ₆ = SR + 300 mg aa/kg diet + 0.02 % acify	213.33	335.33 ^{abc}	480.33	412.00 ^b	448.33	377.86
T ₇ = SR+ 300 mg aa/kg diet + 0.03 % acify	210.00	361.53 ^a	458.47	456.47 ^a	433.40	383.97
LSD	ns	27.58	ns	33.63	ns	
CV %	4.87	4.74	3.69	4.54	10.24	
SE m +	5.84	9.09	10.10	11.09	26.12	

Means within the column followed by the different superscript are significantly different (P< 0.05) by DMRT

FEED CONVERSION

The average weekly FCR with different levels of organic acids is presented in Table 6. The analysis of variance for feed conversion ratio (FCR) showed a significant difference ($P < 0.05$) in the 3rd week but was not significant during the rest of the study period. In the 3rd week significantly poor feed efficiency (2.03) was recorded in T₃ than T₇ and T₄ (1.75, 1.79) respectively which was at par with the rest of the treatments. The poor feed efficiency was observed in T₃, as it had higher feed consumption and had lower body weight gain at respective weeks and better feed efficiency was observed in birds fed on T₇ and T₄ diets. This might be due to the reduced bacterial numbers in the small intestine which resulted in decreased gut wall thickness and increased villi length and thus improved feed conversion. These effects helped to compensate for the removal of antibiotic growth promoter in diet. Rahmani and Speer (2005) reported that the feed conversion of broiler chick up to 21 and 42 days were 1.38 and 1.75, 1.43 and 1.81, 1.48 and 2.04 respectively for natural additive, organic acid and control group.

Table 6: The Average Weekly Feed Conversion Ratio of Vencobb Broilers Fed Diet with Organic Acids as an Alternative to Antibiotics

Treatment	Period (Week) and Feed Efficiency					Overall Mean
	2	3	4	5	6	
T ₁ = Standard ration (SR)	1.83	1.96 ^{ab}	1.73	2.29 ^{ab}	2.77	2.12
T ₂ = SR + antibiotics	1.80	1.95 ^{ab}	1.71	2.47 ^a	2.41	2.07
T ₃ = SR + 300 mg aa/kg diet	1.77	2.03 ^a	1.75	2.37 ^{ab}	2.49	2.08
T ₄ = SR + 0.02 % acify	1.76	1.79 ^{bc}	1.85	2.31 ^{ab}	2.45	2.03
T ₅ = SR + 0.03 % acify	1.77	1.90 ^{abc}	1.81	2.36 ^{ab}	2.53	2.07
T ₆ = SR + 300 mg aa/kg diet + 0.02 % acify	1.73	1.89 ^{abc}	1.80	2.35 ^{ab}	2.51	2.06
T ₇ = SR + 300 mg aa/kg diet + 0.03 % acify	1.74	1.75 ^c	1.87	2.17 ^b	2.7	2.05
LSD	ns	0.18	ns	0.22	ns	
CV %	4.87	5.23	3.51	5.51	9.79	
SEm ±	0.05	0.06	0.04	0.07	0.14	

Means within the column followed by the different superscript are significantly different ($P < 0.05$) by DMRT.

CONCLUSIONS

From this study, it was concluded that the better live weight gain was obtained when birds were fed diet with ascorbic acid in combination with 0.03 % acify. Hence in order to get better live weight gain, broiler ration could be incorporated with ascorbic acid 300 mg ascorbic acid/kg diet and acify (acidifier) 0.03 % through drinking water.. Considering better live weight gain, it can be inferred that organic acids can be used as an alternative to antibiotics in the diet of broiler chicken. However, further study would be necessary in order to confirm the results before recommending the technology to be adopted by the farmers.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This research was supported by the Directorate of Research, IAAS, Rampur and Hatchery association. The authors wish to express sincere thanks to Directorate of Research, IAAS, Rampur and Hatchery association for their assistance in conducting this research.

REFERENCES

1. Bates, J., Jordens J. Z. and Griffiths D. T. (1994). Farm animals as a putative reservoir for vancomycin resistant enterococcal infection in man. *J. Antimicrob. Chemother.* 34:507-514.

2. Boling, S. D., Snow J. L., Parsons C. M. and Baker D. H.(2001). *The effect of citric acid on calcium and phosphorus requirements of chicks fed corn-soybean meal diets.* Poultry Sci. 80:783-788.
3. Dofing, J. and Gottschal M. (1997). *Microbe-microbe interactions.* In: R. I. Mackle (ed.) *Gastrointestinal microbiology.* New york, Chapman and Hall. pp 373-389.
4. Hadorn, R., Wiedmer H. and Feuerstein, D.(2000). *Effect of different dosages of an organic acid mixture in broiler diets.* Arch. Geflugelk. 65:22-27.
5. Kutlu, H. R. and Forbes J. M. (1993). *Changes in growth and blood parameters in heat-stressed broiler chicks in response to dietary ascorbic acid.* Livestock Production Sci. 4: 35-350.
6. Langhout, P. (2000). *New additives for broiler chickens.* Feed mix Special: Alternatives to antibiotics. pp 24-27.
7. Mckee, J. S., and Harrison P. C. (1995). *Effects of Supplemental Ascorbic acid on the performance of Broiler Chickens Exposed to Multiple Concurrent Stressors.* Poultry Sci.74:1772-1785.
8. Miller, B. F. (1987). *Acidified poultry diets and their implications for the Poultry Industry.* In: T. P. Lyons(ed.). *Biotechnology in the Feed Industry.* Kentucky, Alltech Technical Publications.pp. 199 - 209.
9. Nursey, I. (1997). *Control of salmonella.* Kraftfutter.10: 415-22.
10. Partanen, K., Siljander-Rasi, H., Alaiuhkola, T., Suomi, K. and Fossi, M.(2002). *Performance of growing-finishing pigs fed medium or high-fibre diets supplemented with avilamycin, formic acid or formica-sorbate blend.* Livestock Production Sci. 73:139-152.
11. Patten J. D. and Waldroup P. W. (1988). *Use of organic acids in broiler diets.* Poult Sci. 67(8):1178-82.
12. Rahmani, H. R. and Speer W. (2005). *Natural Additives Influence the Performance and Humoral Immunity of Broilers.* International Journal of Poultry Sci. 4 (9): 713-717.
13. Sarra, P. G., Dellaglio, F. and Bottazzi, V. (1985). *Taxonomy of lactobacilli isolated from the alimentary tract of chickens.* System Appl. Microbiol. 6:86-89.
14. Vogt, V. H., Matthes, S., and Harnisch, S. (1981). *The effect of organic acids in the rations on the performance of broilers and laying hens.* Arch. Gefluelkd. 45: 221-232.s